



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,555	07/10/2001	Pierre Hirsbrunner	81358-200	7190
28765	7590	08/24/2004	EXAMINER	
WINSTON & STRAWN PATENT DEPARTMENT 1400 L STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3502			KOSLOW, CAROL M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1755	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/902,555

Applicant(s)

HIRSBRUNNER ET AL.

Examiner

C. Melissa Koslow

Art Unit

1755

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6 and 17-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20-27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 18, 19 and 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1755

This action is in response to the amendment of 19 July 2004. Applicants' arguments and amendment to claims 19 and 27 have overcome the 35 USC 112 rejections. Applicants' amendments to claims 1 and 28 have overcome the rejection over U.S. patent 6,368,659 (Weber et al). Upon further consideration the 35 USC 103 rejection over Brown has been changed to a 35 USC 102(b) rejection.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 18, 19 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Brown (U.S. patent 2,905,562).

This reference teaches a substrate treating solution for imparting hydrophobicity to the substrate consisting of an aqueous solution of an alkali metal silicate and an alkali metal alkyl siliconate. Run numbers 7-9 teach aqueous compositions containing 1.25 wt% sodium silicate and 0.25 wt% sodium methyl siliconate; 2.5 wt% sodium silicate and 0.5 wt% sodium methyl siliconate and 5 wt% sodium silicate and 1 wt% sodium methyl siliconate. The molar ratio for each example is 2.5, based on sodium silicate having the taught formula $\text{Na}_2\text{O} \cdot 3.22\text{SiO}_2$. The composition and molar ratios fall within the claimed ranges. The reference teaches the claimed composition. Since the claimed and taught composition are identical, one of ordinary skill in the art would expect the taught composition to have inherently have the claimed properties of claims 1, 19 and 28 and the claimed composition of claim 18.

Art Unit: 1755

In response to applicant's argument that the taught composition is not used as an agricultural soil treatment composition, the intended use of a claimed product does not obviate anticipation. *In re King* 231 USPQ 136 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In addition the recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural or compositional difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art composition is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). There is no compositional difference between the claimed invention and Weber et al shows that the taught composition is capable of performing the intended use.

Claims 20-27 are allowable over the cited art of record.

Claims 6 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

These claims are allowable for the reasons given in the previous office actions.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melissa Koslow whose telephone number is (571) 272-1371. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 3:30 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Bell, can be reached at (571) 272-1362.

The fax number for all official communications is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 1755

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cmk
August 23, 2004


C. Melissa Koslow
Primary Examiner
Tech. Center 1700